

Exhibit AP

Page 1	Page 2
<p>NO. 16-CI-03503 JEFFERSON CIRCUIT COURT DIVISION TEN (10)</p> <p>DONNA ANN HAYES PLAINTIFF</p> <p>VS. TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>JULY 23, 2019</p> <p>COLGATE-PALMOLIVE COMPANY, ET AL. DEFENDANTS</p> <p>* * *</p> <p>Heard before the Hon. Angela McCormick Bisig, Judge, Jefferson Circuit Court, Division 3, Louisville Justice Center, Louisville, Kentucky.</p> <p>* * *</p> <p>NANCY L. NUNNELLEY, R.M.R. Coulter Reporting, LLC East Kentucky Street Suite 200 Louisville, Kentucky 40203 (502) 582-1627 FAX: (502) 587-6299</p>	<p>I N D E X</p> <p>WITNESS: WILLIAM LONGO, Ph.D.</p> <p>Direct Examination by Mr. Satterley..... 6 Cross Examination by Mr. Dubin..... 111 Cross Examination by Mr. Mularczyk..... 212 Redirect Examination by Mr. Satterley..... 253 Recross Examination by Mr. Dubin..... 270 Recross Examination by Mr. Mularczyk..... 279 Redirect Examination by Mr. Satterley..... 281</p> <p>WITNESS: LEE POYE</p> <p>Direct Examination by Mr. Satterley..... 283</p> <p>Reporter's Certificate Page..... 327</p> <p>* * *</p>
Page 3	Page 4
<p>A P P E A R A N C E S</p> <p>FOR THE PLAINTIFF:</p> <p>JOSEPH D. SATTERLEY PAUL J. KELLEY Satterley & Kelley 8700 Westport Road, Suite 202 Louisville, Kentucky 40242 Jsatterley@satterleylaw.com Pkelly@satterleylaw.com</p> <p>FOR THE DEFENDANT, COLGATE-PALMOLIVE COMPANY:</p> <p>MEREDITH M. SHAW Quinn Emanuel Urquhart & Sullivan, LLP 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor New York, New York 10010 Meredithshaw@quinnemanuel.com</p> <p>EDWARD M. SLAUGHTER Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani 2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 4100 West Dallas, Texas 75201 ESlaughter@grsm.com</p> <p>PETER M. MULARCZYK Foley & Mansfield 300 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2800 Los Angeles, California 90017 Pmularczyk@foleymansfield.com</p> <p>MATTHEW W. BREETZ FREDERICK R. BENTLEY Stites & Harbison, PLLC 400 West Market Street, Suite 1800 Louisville, Kentucky 40202 Wbreetz@stites.com Rbentley@stites.com</p>	<p>FOR THE DEFENDANT, JOHNSON & JOHNSON:</p> <p>MORTON DUBIN MATTHEW BUSH PAIGE PAVONE NINA TROVATO Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP 51 West 52nd Street New York, New York 10019-6119 Mdubin@orrick.com Ppavone@orrick.com Mbush@orrick.com Ntrovato@orrick.com</p> <p>R. SCOTT MASTERSON Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith, LLP 1180 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 2900 Atlanta, Georgia 30309 Scott.Masterson@lewisbrisboiscom</p> <p>***</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 177</p> <p>1 at that time is that testing with those two 2 methods was the industry standard for asbestos 3 analysis at that time, and provided Scott's with a 4 reasonable basis to believe that consumer use of 5 their Libby vermiculite products did not cause any 6 significant exposure, correct? 7 A. That's what I stated, yes. 8 Q. And you also said that any 9 suggestion that some of these independent 10 laboratories, or Scott's, should have had the 11 knowledge or foresight to do further testing -- 12 and I'm skipping a few words to -- with ATEM after 13 negative results with XRD and optical microscopy 14 in the 1970s is not reasonable or scientifically 15 valid, right? 16 A. That is absolutely correct, for 17 Scott's -- 18 Q. Okay. 19 A. -- Fertilizer Company. 20 Q. And you also pointed out one of the 21 reasons why you thought -- now, they did not do -- 22 or did not have done for them TEM work, right? 23 A. That's correct. 24 Q. Okay. And I think you believe that 25 TEM is the most sensitive method to look for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 178</p> <p>1 asbestos in trace quantities, correct? 2 A. It is. I asked them why they did 3 not -- they relied on their outside labs. And 4 McCrone was their primary lab. McCrone didn't 5 advise them to use TEM. 6 Q. Okay. Actually what you said is, 7 "One of the problems in the 1970s was that there 8 were very few, if any, ATEMs in commercial 9 laboratories that had the appropriate technology 10 to perform accurate trace amphibole contaminant 11 analysis," right? 12 A. And that's true. 13 Q. And you said that in defending 14 Scott's -- when you said that defending Scott's, 15 did you know that McCrone had a TEM? 16 A. Yes. McCrone had a TEM and that's 17 why I asked Ian Stewart, he was retired, why they 18 never told Scott's to do TEM when they had a TEM. 19 And Ian Stewart says, "Because there was nothing 20 there. We didn't think it was necessary." 21 So you're asking a fertilizer company, 22 depending on other -- other -- other consultants 23 to be able to determine that. That's why I stated 24 when they were using PLM and XRD, they were doing 25 the appropriate analysis.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 179</p> <p>1 And the second part of this is, the 2 vermiculite from Libby, Montana, nobody is 3 disputing that it has asbestos in it. We're not 4 looking at, like, cosmetic talc. We know we were 5 starting with an asbestos-containing material with 6 accessory minerals, well understood, and we were 7 looking at did their process reduce the amount of 8 asbestos. 9 So I stick to everything I say in there. 10 But you can't compare a fertilizer company to a 11 giant pharmaceutical company and what they should 12 have known or not known about using transmission 13 electron microscopy. That is just not fair. 14 Q. Okay. But you do know, if we go to 15 slide 54, you do know that Johnson & Johnson went 16 beyond the J-41 standard and beyond what Scott's 17 did and did have McCrone do TEM work for them? 18 A. Yes, sir. I know that -- well, I 19 know that after I got involved in this when all 20 the secret documents came out. 21 Q. Okay. 22 MR. DUBIN: Your Honor, move to strike 23 the nonresponsive portion of that answer. 24 MR. SATTERLEY: I'll object to that. 25 THE COURT: I'll allow him to say it.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 180</p> <p>1 You can further question him about it if you'd 2 like. 3 Q. Sir, my question is a simple one, 4 and I appreciate you responding to my questions 5 that I'm asking you. Is that okay? Will you do 6 that? 7 A. Yes, sir. I tried, when I get a 8 question, I tried to explain it in full. 9 Q. Okay. Did Johnson & Johnson go 10 beyond J4-1 and do -- have McCrone do TEM work for 11 them? 12 A. I thought I said yes. 13 Q. Okay. Thank you. 14 And I think you've already mentioned that 15 Scott's, the company that you were working for, 16 the attorneys for Scott's, the lab that they used 17 was McCrone, right? 18 A. Correct. 19 Q. The same McCrone? 20 A. Yes, sir. 21 Q. And in that context, you said when 22 you were representing the defendant, that McCrone 23 would have been a good choice in the 1970s for a 24 company to go to to test a product like talc? 25 Actually you said that in this -- in this context.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 325</p> <p>1 the time that you have had with the witnesses that 2 we've had thus far. I just want to say that 3 hasn't occurred. 4 MR. SATTERLEY: And I -- 5 THE COURT: So you're saying if you 6 take 10 minutes and then I'm going to let them 7 take three or four hours, that's not going to 8 happen. 9 MR. SATTERLEY: I wasn't suggesting 10 that, Your Honor. What I'm suggesting is if we 11 start at 9:30 and I turn the witness over at 9:40 12 and they cross-examine till 11 and I still have a 13 treating doctor, my -- the decedent, 49 minutes, 14 and within that there's cross-examination within 15 that. 16 THE COURT: I understand. 17 MR. SATTERLEY: And the treating 18 doctor. 19 THE COURT: So if I give you till 20 2 o'clock, I've basically given you the time you 21 asked me for when we started this conversation. 22 MR. SATTERLEY: Assuming the 23 cross-examination is short. That's the assumption 24 that -- 25 THE COURT: Right. But, again, you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 326</p> <p>1 made decisions when Dr. Egilman was on the stand 2 to talk about a lot of things. And, again, that's 3 your decision. 4 MR. SATTERLEY: Okay. 5 THE COURT: I'm giving you basically 6 what you asked me for in terms of time. I will 7 not -- I can tell you I won't allow them to 8 cross-examine any witness double the time that 9 they're on or that will be accounted for. I will 10 allow them to build in there some 11 cross-examination. And I have differed from the 12 schedule somewhat. 13 MR. SATTERLEY: I understand. 14 THE COURT: Mostly in your -- in your 15 favor in terms of giving you more time and taking 16 time away from them. 17 MR. SATTERLEY: I understand, Your 18 Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. I'll see 20 you-all in the morning. 21 *** *** *** 22 23 24 25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 327</p> <p>1 STATE OF KENTUCKY 2 COUNTY OF JEFFERSON 3 I, NANCY L. NUNNELLEY, RMR, Notary Public, 4 State of Kentucky at Large, do hereby certify that 5 the foregoing deposition was taken at the time and 6 place stated in the caption; that the appearances 7 were as set forth in the caption; that prior to 8 giving their testimony the witness was first duly 9 sworn by me, that said testimony was taken down by me 10 in stenographic notes and thereafter reduced under my 11 supervision to the foregoing typewritten pages and 12 that said typewritten transcript is a true, accurate 13 and complete record of my stenographic notes so 14 taken. 15 I further certify that I am not related by 16 blood or marriage to any of the parties hereto and 17 that I have no interest in the outcome of captioned 18 case. 19 My commission as Notary Public expires July 10, 20 2023. 21 Given under my hand this the 24th day of 22 July, 2019, at Louisville, Kentucky. 23 24 25 NOTARY PUBLIC</p>	